

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 4, 1911

No. 5

On December 10, 1909, Professor J. P. Postgate delivered as his Inaugural Address as Professor of Latin in the University of Liverpool a paper entitled *Dead Language and Dead Languages*, with Special Reference to Latin. The address has been published as a pamphlet of 32 pages, by John Murray, London (1910: 30 cents).

Professor Postgate warned his hearers (p. 6) that at times his treatment might seem polemical, at other times trite and familiar; in either case, he said, the responsibility rested with "the bitter and unceasing assailants of our ancient studies", whose assaults must be met at every point, with spirit and vigor to match their own.

First, then, Professor Postgate considers the charge that Latin and Greek are dead languages because the Greeks and Romans are dead. But, says our author, "does the death of the artist rob the work of its value?" The real difficulty which the critics of the Classics find in Latin, for instance, is "not that the language is dead, but that it is foreign, and that Latin is but in the same category as French or German, or, indeed, as any language but your own. The statement, then, that Latin and Greek are languages of the dead we admit to be true; but we set it aside as unimportant, and as such it gives us no further concern".

The second criticism met is the charge that Latin is a dead language because it is no longer spoken or written and because it is incapable of expressing the ideas of modern life. But, says Mr. Postgate (7), it is still widely used—by the Roman Catholic Church, in its ritual, and in the converse of colleges and religious houses, and in newspapers in more than one civilized community (see *The Classical Review* 12.430). Again, he says, "outside the technical regions of our specialists, and apart from the nomenclature of peculiar products of our civilization, it would be found equal to any demands of expression that we might make upon it, and . . . I earnestly hope and trust that there will be nothing in all that I say to-day which it would not be capable of expressing". This leads to a plea for the study of colloquial Latin. Assuming again, for the sake of argument, continues the author, that such a question as "Shall I telephone for your motor?" cannot be put into the Latin of Cicero or Caesar, it may be said in reply that such a sentence cannot be put

into Shakesperean English. Is then the language of Shakespere a dead language? (9). In a word, every language with a history has various stages to which the phrase 'dead language' might be applied with as much (or as little) justice as to Latin.

All this leads Professor Postgate to divide languages as follows (9): A. Native and spoken. B. Native and not spoken (Past Native Speech). C. Foreign and spoken. D. Foreign and not spoken (Past Foreign Speech). He then points out (10)—what is commonly overlooked—that a knowledge of a foreign language is after all of comparatively little value. This is especially true of Frenchmen "whose speech has an international currency", and far more true—yes, increasingly true—of Englishmen (and Americans). There follows a rather curious argument (11-12) to the effect that "it has long been felt that learning foreign languages for the sole object of conversation or correspondence with their speakers was a waste of human energy, and that international communications should be made through international speech". He praises Ido, a new international language, backed by Professor Jespersen and others, which "will be appreciably smoother and easier to learn than Esperanto; and if I may trust the numerical tests which I have applied, 85 per cent of its vocabulary will be immediately intelligible to an Englishman who has a knowledge of Latin".

To our author (12-13), "a knowledge of some foreign language, ancient or modern, is the bare irreducible minimum for anyone who desires to be educated in any true sense of the term, and . . . for him who would have a liberal education two are required. Such a one would own the treasure which Ennius, the father of Latin poetry, described when he said, with a grip upon reality not always observable in modern professors of education, that he had three souls, because he could speak Latin, Greek, and Oscan". From a strictly materialistic or commercial side one who knows English has least need to master any foreign language. But from the intellectual and spiritual side, in order really to know English itself, he must study the languages which have gone to make English and which throw light on its character. What foreign languages shall he choose? Those, says Professor Postgate, whose study will give the most benefit. Since, then, Latin, as also Greek, requires more time and trouble for its study

than either French or German, the benefit derived from its study must be correspondingly greater. To some psychologists this argument will, I suppose, be anathema; to ordinary common sense it seems axiomatic. Human speech, the author continues (13), is subject always to change. French, Spanish, etc., are not 'descended' from Latin (such language involves a mistaken metaphor, in a word, tells an untruth); they *are* Latin or forms of Latin. So we may call Latin the oldest Italian, the oldest Spanish, the oldest French. From this point of view, then, Latin is not a dead language. It follows with equal force that to the students of the Romance or Neo-Latin languages the charm of the study of the old Roman tongue should be well-nigh irresistible. I may quote here the words of a professor of Romance languages to a class in Old French: "If it were not for Latin, we should have no use whatever for any of you".

C. K.

(To be continued.)

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FORCELLINI LEXICON¹

One of the first surprises that the student of the Classics meets is the frequent uncertainty of the authorship of the works that have come down to us from antiquity. The authorship of the great works is usually certain, or tolerably so, but as the student leaves the beaten track of the literature, he finds questions of authenticity assuming more and more frequent importance. The reasons for this are familiar and obvious, and I shall not waste space by dwelling upon them here. What I wish to emphasize and illustrate is that even in our own times the question of authenticity has sometimes been obscured, to the manifest injury of the real author. The case I have taken is the authorship of the Forcellini *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*. One who consults the ordinary books of reference on this question soon becomes involved in a maze of contradictions and inaccuracies. The *Century Dictionary*, under Forcellini and Facciolati, credits each of these scholars with the authorship of the work. *Harpers' Classical Dictionary*, under Forcellini, says: "His ability and industry soon gave him an honorable rank, so that he was appointed assistant to Facciolati, with whom his name is inseparably associated in their joint work (*Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*), whose completion was in great part due to the untiring labor of Forcellini". From this statement one certainly gets the impression that Facciolati conceived the work, began it, and did a large share of the labor involved in its preparation, while Forcellini brought it to a close. The same impression is conveyed by what we read in the same volume under the name of Facciolati: "After putting

forth several new editions of existing books, . . . he began his magnificent work, the *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, the first volume of which appeared at Padua in 1771 . . . an imperishable monument to the learning, industry, and judgment of its chief author. In its preparation he was ably assisted by his pupil, Egidio Forcellini, to whom is said to be due the suggestion of the new lexicon itself". Here again, Facciolati is "the chief author" of the work. Forcellini is not ignored; he is even credited with the original conception of the plan, but his share in the work is distinctly represented as subordinate.

Turning to the article *Lexicon* in the *Harpers' Dictionary*, we read: "Forcellini's labors on the revision of *Calepinus* had taught him the need of a more perfect lexicon, and he undertook to construct it. For forty years he toiled, and at his death left in manuscript the greatest contribution to this department of science ever achieved by a single hand, the *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*". Thus, while under the names of Facciolati and Forcellini the *Harpers' Classical Dictionary* attributes the *Lexicon* to Facciolati, under the article *Lexicon* it attributes it just as unqualifiedly to Forcellini alone, without mention of Facciolati. The ordinary reader must certainly be puzzled by these conflicting statements, and must wonder whether the work represents the genuine collaboration of two scholars; if not, whether in conception and execution it is essentially Facciolati's, or Forcellini's. I might add that the *Universal Cyclopedia* and certain other works I have consulted are no less contradictory than those I have already cited¹. I trust therefore that it will not seem superfluous to present the evidence bearing upon the question of the authorship of the *Lexicon*.

In testing the truth of the conflicting statements which meet us in connection with the names of Facciolati and Forcellini, we naturally turn to the title-page of the original edition of the *Lexicon*, published at Padua in 1771. This reads: *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon, Consilio et Cura Jacobi Facciolati, Opera et Studio Aegidii Forcellini lucubratum*. The obvious implication of this title-page is that Facciolati planned the *Lexicon* and worked on it, receiving assistance from Forcellini.

But before we accept the evidence of the title-page, we need to know more about its origin. Who wrote it? This takes us back to the circumstances of the publication of the *Dictionary*. In 1771, the year of publication, Forcellini had been dead three years. He had brought the work to a close in 1753. Some years were then devoted to the transcription by a friend. The copying was completed and the manuscript was handed over by Forcellini to the Library of the Padua Seminary, where it reposed for years. Forcellini died in 1768. The following year Cardinal

¹This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Princeton University, April 22, 1911.

¹The account by Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 2.374 f., though necessarily brief, is essentially correct.

Prioli was appointed to the see of Padua. This enlightened ecclesiastic at once recognized the importance of the manuscript and sent the book to the printer. This was early in 1769. As it went to press, the title-page read: *Latinitatis Totius Lexicon in Patavino Seminario cura et opera Aegidii Forcellini lucubratum*. No mention here of Facciolati, either as author of the plan of the work, or as aiding in its preparation. But Facciolati was still living, at the advanced age of 87, and in some way exercised his influence to secure an alteration of the title-page and to procure the insertion of his own name before that of Forcellini, so that as published the book seemed to belong chiefly to Facciolati.

Let us examine whether there was justification for this tampering with the manuscript copy. In determining this question, we can hardly do better than give a short sketch of the relations between Forcellini and Facciolati. It was about 1710 when Forcellini graduated from the Paduan Seminary, of which Facciolati, only six years his senior, was the head. Soon after his graduation, Forcellini's services were enlisted by the Director in the preparation of a Greek lexicon. This work, a revision of the Lexicon of Schrevelius, appeared in 1715. Not only Forcellini, but other pupils also of Facciolati had aided in the revision; Facciolati's name is the only one upon the title-page. A similar experience fell to Forcellini's lot in 1718, when the *Ortografia Italiana Moderna* was published. Despite its name, this work was essentially a dictionary. The labor on it seems to have been performed mainly, if not entirely, by Forcellini. Yet again it is Facciolati's name that adorns the title-page. The book had great vogue, going through eight editions between 1718 and 1741. Forcellini's brother and his friend Natalis dalla Laste resented the omission of Forcellini's name, and dalla Laste in the preface to one of his own works publicly referred to "the *Ortografia* of Signor Egidio Forcellini, which by some subtle artifice had thus far been published under the name of Facciolati". Finally in the eighth edition of the *Ortografia*, published in 1741, Facciolati made belated acknowledgment of the share borne by Forcellini in the various editions of this work. A letter which Forcellini himself writes to his brother Marco at this time and in this connection gives us a most pleasing impression of his character and temper. So far from complaining at the injustice done him by the omission of his name from the first seven editions of the *Ortografia*, he is modest enough to say that he does not deserve and cannot deserve to be enrolled among the scholars of his time, and that he regrets that Signor Dottore Facciolati has mentioned him in the Preface to the new edition of the *Ortografia*. In editing this letter many years later, Forcellini's brother adds: "En! Quo modo de se loquebatur noster Aegidius!"

Almost contemporary with the issue of the *Ortografia* was that of the revision of the old Latin lexicon of Calepio. Forcellini had labored diligently, assisting Facciolati with this work, between the years 1715 and 1718. Facciolati had probably done the major part of the labor on this volume, and the work might fairly be called his; yet Forcellini is not mentioned even by name. In the Preface Facciolati merely says that he has had the assistance of a "strenuissimus adolescens".

Here then we have three instances in which Facciolati seems to have been willing to take to himself the credit of another's work; and one of the instances was so bad as to cause a public scandal at the time. These facts may make it easier for us to form a judgment concerning any doubtful points connected with the authorship of the *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*.

In connection with the authorship of the Lexicon, two questions present themselves. First, to whom belongs the credit for the conception of the new dictionary? Second, to whom belongs the credit for its execution? To both of these questions I answer unhesitatingly: To Forcellini, and to him alone. When after forty years of labor he had brought to a close the manuscript of the Lexicon and had given it to Ludovico Violato to be transcribed, he prepared a little memorandum, which fortunately has been preserved, though never printed till De-Vits's edition of the Lexicon in 1858. In this memorandum Forcellini begins with a Latin couplet:

Phoebus utrumque polum decies quater axe revisit
hoc nostra immensum dum manus urget opus.

He then goes on to say that his revision of the old Calepio in 1715-1718 had taught him that further revisions of that Lexicon were useless, and that what was needed was an entirely new work. Accordingly toward the end of 1718, he tells us, he had begun the present Lexicon at the command of the Bishop of Padua. He then gives us the details of his long task, telling of his progress and his interruptions. It took nearly three and a half years to finish the letter A; at the end of six years he had reached *comitor*, when he was suddenly called away for seven years. During this time work was completely suspended—from 1724 to 1731. Returning to his labors in 1731, he worked continuously for eleven years, reaching the word *pone* in 1742. At that time he was appointed confessor to the local clergy, a duty which left him such scant leisure for the Lexicon that for the next nine years his progress was extremely slow. At length in 1751 he was released from his post as confessor and was again enabled to devote his entire energy to his great task. It is an interesting coincidence that he resumed his labors at this time with the word *thesaurus*. In February, 1753, the monumental undertaking was completed in the first draft, and was handed over to Ludovico Violato to be

copied. This is the substance of the memorandum, written in Forcellini's own hand at the time he ended the work. One reference in the memorandum I have designedly omitted. Forcellini tells us that he had undertaken the work *ductu Jacobi Facciolati*. But this is probably the exaggeration of his own simple, unassuming, nature. From the Preface of the Lexicon, of which I shall speak presently, we can only infer that this *dictu* implies no more than that Facciolati had approved of the plan and had possibly given occasional advice.

I have just been speaking of the private memorandum left by Forcellini. We come now to the Preface of his work. In this he tells us that Facciolati had planned two lexicons, a Greek and a Latin. The Greek with the assistance of Forcellini and others he had published: "but the Latin", says Forcellini, "because it was seen to require more attention, he turned over to me to prepare alone, not that he thought I possessed any special ability, but because he saw that I had health and capacity for sustained effort. And so, after forty years", he continues, "the work is ended, I performing the labor, he furnishing advice and assistance, *me praebente manum, illo consilium atque opem*". Just how much may be understood by *consilium et opem* might be hard to say, were it not that Forcellini in his memorandum has given us such a detailed account of the progress of the work, letter by letter. Its progress, we saw, depended on Forcellini's leisure; its stagnation always followed his occupation with other duties. Apparently then, *consilium et opem* are nothing more than the utterances of a generous spirit, loyal still to his old teacher, despite the scant justice which Facciolati had accorded to Forcellini's earlier assistance.

The general conclusions I have indicated are confirmed by all other evidence bearing on the case. The man who finally put the Lexicon through the press after the death of Forcellini was Gaietano Cognolati. He also supplied a special preface to the work. In this he pays the loftiest tribute to Forcellini's character and genius. "In him", he says, "there were *ingenium, litterae, cura, cogitatio, diligentia*. He was thoroughly versed in everything pertaining to Roman literature, institutions, and history; he was also well trained in Greek. I mourn his loss, now that he is taken from us, as much as I revered him himself when alive. Never can I forget that man, since with his interest in literature he combined the sort of character for forming which literature is intended". Cognolati then goes on to describe what Forcellini had achieved in his great work, going into minute detail. But not once is the name of Facciolati mentioned, though its omission is inexplicable except on the assumption that he had no real share in the undertaking.

It remains to consider a letter written by Fac-

ciolati himself, soon after Forcellini had finished his labors on the Dictionary and at the time Violato was busy in the preparation of the fair copy. The letter is addressed to Joseph Lasta, Librarian of St. Mark's at Venice. Lasta apparently had heard rumors bearing on the validity of Facciolati's claims to the authorship of the revised Calepio, and seems to have inquired of Facciolati for the facts. With characteristic lack of frankness, Facciolati begins by saying: "How's that, my friend? You say I didn't write the Calepio? I never pretended to. Calepio wrote it". He then goes on to say that in the revision of the Calepio he had availed himself of the services of Forcellini, and, pleased by the reception which that work had met, he had undertaken a new lexicon which should be as complete as could be made, employing the assistance of the same Forcellini. The work, he says, proceeded with various vicissitudes until its completion in 1753. The last two lines of the letter are these: *Vix ego in plerasque litteras quippiam contuli praeter consilium. Princeps hujus operis conditor atque adeo unus Forcellinus est. Under most of the letters I furnished nothing but advice. The chief author of this work, and in fact the only one is Forcellini*. This is undoubtedly the truth, spoken in a moment of contrition. I say, in a moment of contrition, for when, twelve years later, the printing of the book began, Facciolati was not only willing to claim the chief credit for it, but actually succeeded in accomplishing his purpose, as we see by the title-page of the original edition. Worse than this, he endeavored to suppress the admission which he had made in his letter to Lasta from which I just quoted, and actually reprinted the letter twice omitting the significant words: *Princeps hujus operis conditor atque adeo unus est Forcellinus*.

Such seem to be the facts concerning the authorship of the Lexicon. Facciolati, while certainly not lacking in gifts, appears to have been a man of small character, ready always to utilize the services of others and to take to himself the credit for their work. In the case of the revision of Schrevelius, of Calepio, and in the preparation of the *Ortografia Italiana*, he did not hesitate to ignore the important services rendered by Forcellini and others. In the case of the *Ortografia*, it was only when forced by what was virtually a public exposure, that he tardily, in his eighth edition, made recognition of Forcellini's share in the work. Forcellini, on the other hand, was one of those simple, sweet, unresentful natures that might almost be said to invite imposition. Ambition does not appear to have stirred him. He saw the need of doing the work. If others wished to claim the credit, it was not for one so unworthy as he to protest; and even when others did protest in his name, and with success, he seems actually to have been pained.

As to the conception of the idea and plan of the great Lexicon, we have Faccioliati's own statement in one of his rare moments of frankness that Forcellini was solely responsible for it. In the execution of the work, it seems equally clear that Faccioliati had no hand. He himself admits that for most letters he furnished nothing but advice. In view of what we know of his character and methods, it is probably safe to infer that he actually wrote no part of the Lexicon. That at times he conversed with Forcellini about the work is very likely. But such conversations do not establish the faintest claim to credit as joint author. Least of all can there be any defense for the alteration of the title-page of the original edition, procured at Faccioliati's instance and through his influence. To steal a dead man's work is doubly base.

For nearly a century every reprint of the Lexicon repeated the misleading title-page. It remained for Vincente De-Vit to show by the citation of the documents to which I have referred¹ how baseless were the claims of Faccioliati, and in the Prato edition of 1858 to restore a true title of the work.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

To the kindness of Professor Kelsey we are indebted for a copy of the following letter, which appeared in *The Daily Mail* (London), July 29, 1911.

There is no one in the world so fiercely dogmatic as the apostle of change. With nothing save first principles to aid him, he is ready to outrage the accumulated wisdom of all the ages. He lives in an atmosphere of reckless experiment, and yet refuses to accept responsibility for the evil that he does. His ignorance is complete and invincible; his pride matches his ignorance. For him, whatever is wrong, and so little respect does he cherish for the past that he thinks himself competent to devise a hundred schemes for the regeneration of the race.

It is not often that we are fortunate enough to see the beginning and end of a loudly trumpeted reform. That good fortune is ours to-day. During the last few years the humanities have been assailed in France with peculiar bitterness. That light-witted country, whose custom it is to question all things, to proceed gaily from false premises to a logical conclusion, has succeeded at last in the practical suppression of the dead languages. In her lycées and universities she has resolved to teach nothing that will not be of use to her pupils in their future career. The formula is perfectly familiar to us. We may now measure the havoc that has been wrought by its parrot-like repetition.

In obedience to popular clamour, the professors of France resolved to replace the literary education, which had held sway for centuries, by a study of exact science. They kept sternly in view the demands of counting-house and workshop. We will not train the boy's mind, said they; we will pack his brain with useful facts. He shall not think; he shall remember. Strictly cut off from a knowledge of the past, he shall live solely in the present. Thus there will be no waste of force. A full pocket shall reward his industry, and if his head is empty

of those general ideas which cumbered his father's, so much the better for him. He will get rich the more quickly.

A Lesson from France.—A vain hope, which has not been realized. The abolition of the humanities in France has been followed by an ominous decay in the national intelligence. The utilitarian system of education, which was to increase tenfold the 'efficiency' of France, has proved a disastrous failure. The calculating machine beloved to-day is no proper substitute for a thinking, sentient man. In the craft of letters the deficiency is the most conspicuous. After all, the humblest writer cannot expect success without some knowledge of the instrument he uses, and it is only through the 'dead languages' that we may arrive at an understanding of those which still live. Many years ago Matthew Arnold declared that the journey-work of literature was far better done in France than in England, and he attributed the superiority to the influence of Richelieu's famous academy. Alas! the influence of the academy, vastly over-rated by Matthew Arnold, is to-day dead or dying; and the suppression of Latin and Greek has removed the last check which was laid upon the careless misuse of the French tongue. If we praise the journalism of modern Paris, we praise it as those who find a magnificence in the half-understood. French is not so stubborn a language as English. The novice may write it with a facility which looks at first sight as though it were genuine. Ever since Voltaire revealed his method to an eager world, a set of stock phrases, 'clichés' they call them, has been at the service of anyone who can afford a fountain pen. Unfortunately, the mind undisciplined by the study of Latin and Greek does not understand the stock phrases which the fountain pen traces mechanically upon paper. Never was there so rash and careless a creature as the French journalist. Knowing no other speech than his own, he cannot refrain from embellishing his periods with Latin and English tags.

Where Science has failed.—It is here indeed that the French journalist is more painfully deficient. Knowing not Latin, which is the mother of French, he does not understand the origins and associations of the phrases he employs. It is not clear to him (how should it be?) that words, like ancient houses or the faces of men and women, are marked and scarred by their past history. The science which was to have saved his soul alive has not taught him to think or given him the rudiments of style. Reckless of analysis, he confuses his images with the abandonment of an Irishman. But there is the difference between his mixed metaphors and Irish 'bulls'. The humor of an Irish bull is always half-conscious. When Sir Boyle Roche said, "I smell a rat; I see it hurtle through the air; but I will nip it in the bud", it was a stroke of genius. He joyfully paraded his own extravagance. There was no pride in the French reporter who solemnly declared the other day that "Mme. Judic's talent was like a bottle of ink in which the scalpel must not be used too freely for fear of finding there only a pinch of cinders". That is the folly of an illiterate man who has never been taught to think or to see in words anything more than lifeless symbols.

But it is not the men of letters who denounce most bitterly the evil influence of 'practical' education. It is the man of science, the engineers, the captains of industry. The makers of steel, the inspectors of mines, the chiefs of the medical schools are uniting in a protest against the tyranny of

¹ In the Preface to his edition of the Lexicon.

science. They are discovering what they should have known from the beginning, that humane letters are the best training even for those who are destined to earn their bread in a factory. Discipline of mind and a clear habit of thought are necessary in the counting-house as in the study; and when the chief of a vast steel works publicly petitions the Minister of Education to bring back the study of Latin and Greek into the schools, because without them he cannot obtain efficient engineers, here is an argument for the classics which even those will understand who look no further than 'the boy's future career'.

Modern Languages no Substitute.—It has been discovered, moreover, that the modern languages are no proper substitute for the ancient. The German and English taught in French schools are commercial and no more. They do not help those who study them to cultivate what gift of expressions they may possess. They do no more than accentuate the onesidedness of modern education, and, if the Minister of Public Education turn a deaf ear to those who petition him, the taste, the fancy, the sense of style, which have always been the peculiar glory of France, will survive only in the rare manifestations of genius.

Here then is a loud and eloquent warning for us all. France has made the experiment of 'practical' education, and it has failed pitifully. At the very moment of France's failure our wiseacres are urging us to follow her dangerous example. That eminent apostle of culture, Dr. Andrew Carnegie, has told us that Greek is of no more use than Choctaw. His colleagues of the steel trade in France do not agree with him, and, as they speak with the voice of experience, we prefer to place our trust in them. In the battle of intelligence the dry bones of arithmetic will be defeated always by the living force of the dead languages. He who would save his soul will assuredly lose it. And the sad ambition of learning to acquire wealth even in the class-room is doomed to disappointment. For once the pleasantest path is also the most profitable. To pass his youth in Arcady is the wisest preparation even for a metallurgist.

AN ENGLISHMAN.

Quite in harmony with the foregoing letter is the following extract from the Paris Letter in *The Evening Post* (New York) for October 14 last.

Just as the French season, unlike the English and German and American, begins by sea and on mountain only in the first days of August when French children are let out of school, so families come home to Paris in these first October days, when boys and girls go back to school; and it is the same for cities and towns all through the provinces. The opening of schools is more than usually interesting this year. Nine years ago what are called the programmes of 1902 changed the whole secondary education of France, that which answers to college training in the United States or, as we used to say, 'liberal education'. It was the result of a long campaign against classical studies and coincided in its application with government's suppression of the religious schools where such studies were most in honor. The main reason for the change was the supposed uselessness of classical studies to the majority of students in their after-life.

Ever since last spring, teachers and academicians, directors of engineering companies, and Chambers of Commerce, have been complaining that the first result

of the new programmes shows already what one of your correspondents has happily termed the inefficiency of non-classical studies. The parents who are now bringing their children back to the Lycées, where the government programmes are applied, will judge the question by government's own standard, which is quite independent of after-usefulness or efficiency. The standard is the success of the students in passing those government examinations which are the only door in France to any liberal profession as distinct from commercial careers. Now it is said that, in these examinations last year, there were able to pass only a little over 40 per cent of the Lycée students bred up on 'vocational' studies, that is, students untainted with Latin and Greek, and all that was once known as humanities that make the young mind the heir of all the ages of men. On the contrary, of the classical students more than 70 per cent passed on to higher professional studies in triumph. If these figures become traditional in the minds of French parents—and if the government out of sheer opposition does not lower the bar of its examinations—this problem of liberal education will solve itself, and we shall see once more generations of Frenchmen bred up on Latin and literature as in the past.

THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB 1911—1912

The first luncheon of the year will come on Saturday, November 18, at twelve o'clock noon, at The Gregorian, Thirty-fifth Street West, between Fifth Avenue and Herald Square, New York City. The address will be delivered by Dr. William Peterson, Principal of McGill University, Montreal. The subject will be *Recent Work on Some of Cicero's Speeches*, a theme for the treatment of which Principal Peterson is particularly well fitted by reason of his special studies in Cicero for the Oxford Classical Text Series.

The second luncheon will occur Saturday, February 3, at twelve o'clock noon, at The Gregorian. The speaker will be Dr. Edward Kennard Rand, Professor of Latin in Harvard University. His subject will be *Ovid and the Spirit of Metamorphosis*. Professor Rand has recently published several papers that have attracted a great deal of attention, among which we may mention *The Early Mediaeval Commentators on Terence*, *Horatian Urbanity in Hesiod* and *The New Education*.

The third luncheon will take place Saturday, April 27, at twelve o'clock noon, at The Gregorian. The address will be delivered by Dr. M. Carey Thomas, President of Bryn Mawr. Her subject will be *Is it possible to retain Latin as one of the Chief Disciplinary Studies of our Modern Curriculum?*

This year again special rates are offered in the joint interest of The New York Latin Club and The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, as follows: (1) \$2.50, for three luncheons and membership in The New York Latin Club; (2) \$4.00 for three luncheons, membership in both Associations and subscription to *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*; (3) \$5.00,

to cover (2) and The Classical Journal; (4) \$6.67, to cover (3) and Classical Philology.

Persons desiring to avail themselves of these offers are requested to communicate with Dr. William F. Tibbetts, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn.

NEGATIVE EXPRESSIONS

Students of Sophocles are aware that Antigone 4 contains a serious crux because good evidence for the test gives two words which mean 'without bane', whereas the context clearly demands 'baneful'. Whether we assume that Sophocles himself became entangled in his own negatives, or reject this idea as being "well-nigh desperate", and accept some emendation, the passage at least shows the ease with which a sentence containing several negatives may confuse us as to the correct meaning; and perhaps even intelligent readers find themselves at times unable to distribute the negative promptly in such a sentence as 'It is not impossible that he would not have succeeded anyhow'.

Probably every well-developed language has combinations of negatives that form an interesting study. The simplest of all, no doubt, is due to the tendency to repeat a negative without thereby making an affirmative. The rule that two negatives make an affirmative does well enough for grammar and logic, but the average mind does not so understand it, and 'I didn't see nobody', while ungrammatical, is not misleading to us any more than it was to the Greeks. In certain connections it was also common in Latin ('Subdivision of the negative', *nihil neque insolens neque gloriosum*), and it is not unknown even in classic English. Compare e. g. Shakespeare's "I will give no thousand crowns, neither". By an extension of the same tendency the Greeks frequently used a superfluous negative after verbs such as *deny*, *doubt*, *prevent*, etc., and this is also found at times in English. There are two examples in The Letters of Jennie Allen to her 'Freind' Miss Musgrave, but I have not the book at hand to quote them. One is like this: "He immediately declined not to go". Compare also Transactions of the Victoria Institute, 37.127, middle: "Certain miraculous astronomical events are emphatically narrated in Scripture. These have been difficulties to many; but no one can deny that they are not in strict accord with the repeated statements that God is ruler of the Heavens"—in which "not", though superfluous, will hardly throw anyone off the track.

When a negative and a comparative occur in the same sentence, many people (perhaps most) find a genuine difficulty. Compare this: 'When the employé reported the matter, he expected nothing less than praise and commendation'. Was praise at the top of the scale of his expectations, or at the bot-

tom? Was he looking for praise and possible reward in addition, or did he think he might receive a sharp reprimand and possibly dismissal? When Aeschines (1.151) speaks of Euripides as "less wise than none of the poets", does this literal translation make us certain that he means to say that in wisdom Euripides was not inferior to any of the poets? Livy tells us (24.35.9) that Marcellus came upon some Syracusans *nihil minus ratus quam illo tempore ac loco Syracusanum sibi exercitum obvium fore*. A German rendering (Freund's) is: "Er erwartete nichts weniger als dass ihm . . . ein syrakusanisches Heer begegnen würde". If the German does not clear it up, try this: a German says his stay at a place was "nothing less than agreeable", and he *means* (as do the Latin and Greek corresponding expressions) that his stay was *anything but agreeable*; that is, there is no word that describes it *less than* the word 'agreeable' does; and so, that Syracusan army was the last thing Marcellus expected to find then and there. Sometimes the German language can reproduce this idiom literally, sometimes it cannot. Thus, it balks in Livy 26.11.2 *nullius rei minore quam hostium metu* ('with a smaller fear of nothing than of the enemy!'), where we find 'indem sie alles andre mehr als die Feinde fürchteten'. Livy does not strictly say that they feared everything else *more* than they feared the enemy, but only that the enemy measured *no higher* than anything else on the scale of their fear; the expression is an understatement (litotes) implying contempt of the enemy.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY. ADDISON HOGUE.

Professor Basil L. Gildersleeve completed on Monday his eightieth year, with no apparent diminution of his intellectual vigor and alertness, or of the sparkling and pungent humor which has been so vital an element in the influence he has exerted upon students and scholars for more than half a century. The place of Greek in the college and university world is very different now from what it was when the young South Carolinian, at the age of twenty-two, gained his doctorate of philosophy at Göttingen, among the first of the long line of American scholars who were to bring to this country the ideals and standards of German learning and science; but in Professor Gildersleeve's lecture-room, as in his published writings, the lamp has been kept burning as bright as ever, through all the changes of time. How little he answers to the vulgar notion of the Greek or Latin specialist has been evidenced month after month, for more than thirty years, in the delightful wit and almost encyclopaedic range of his Brief Mention in The American Journal of Philology, of which he has been the editor from its foundation in the early years of Johns Hopkins University. Of that institution, as of the intellectual and social life of Baltimore, he has been a leading light during the thirty-five years of his professorship there, following upon twenty years as professor in the University of Virginia.—From The Nation, October 26, 1911.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 535 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALES LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNEST RISS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

JUST PUBLISHED

Nutting's Latin Primer

By H. C. Nutting, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Latin, University of California.

50 CENTS

A book for upper grammar grades, that lays a firm foundation for further progress; gives a working vocabulary of nearly 400 words; interests the pupil in Latin as a living, rather than a dead, language; and teaches thoroughly the most fundamental constructions.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

Macmillan's Latin Series

Barss's Nepos: Twenty Lives90

Bain's Poems of Ovid \$1.10

Von Minckwitz's Cicero 1.25

Hodge's Caesar: The Gallic War 1.25

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

84-88 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO

D'OOGIE'S LATIN FOR BEGINNERS \$1.00

A remarkable book with a remarkable record of instant recognition

Constructions are presented from the standpoint of English as far as possible.

The arrangement of material is logical, and fitted to the student's natural capacity.

In the vocabularies are given where possible English derivatives of the Latin word. They have proved a great help.

There are abundant exercises for translation.

There is a carefully selected and well-balanced vocabulary.

A very large percentage of the words occur five or more times in Caesar.

Never before in a Latin textbook have there been such illustrations.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago London

DERIVATION OF WORDS IN LATIN

A handy and useful pamphlet for High School Classes. Price, 15 cts. (stamps not accepted).

Address the author,

A. C. RICHARDSON, 49 Fargo Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.

A LATIN GRAMMAR

By H. E. BURTON, Ph.D., Professor of Latin, Dartmouth College. 90 cents

A new grammar and the only one on the market to-day which is sufficiently clear for the beginner and also sufficiently complete and scholarly for the college student. Its live, vigorous quality makes it extremely interesting; its method of showing the relative importance of facts is very effective.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago

The Back Volumes of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

May be Secured by Writing to

PROFESSOR CHARLES KNAPP

Barnard College, NEW YORK CITY

A Limited number of Sets remains, Price \$1.00 Per Volume

HALE'S LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION

By WILLIAM GARDNER HALE, Head of the Latin Department, University of Chicago.

Cloth, 50 cents.

The book plans as much material only as can be written in one year; this is assumed to be one lesson a week. The entire ground may therefore be covered without leaving gaps in the pupil's study of constructions. The work is confined to those constructions which are common in Caesar. The sentences are not longer than those in other books, but they follow the narrative, are continuous, and are sensible.

The book contains a vocabulary, and most helpfully arranged tables of case-uses and mood-uses. References are given to all the grammars in common use.

ATKINSON, MENTZER & GROVER

New York Chicago Boston Dallas